

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
6 San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5056
7 FAX: (408) 535-5066
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

E-FILED - 8/23/06

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 CHRISTINA MARIE FLORES, and
JOSE LITO CAMPOS,

17 Defendants.
18

No. CR 06-00425 RMW

STIPULATION AND []
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

SAN JOSE VENUE

19
20 On July 24, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for an initial appearance.
21 Assistant United States Attorney Susan Knight informed the Court that the government would
22 provide discovery to both defense counsel as soon as possible. Therefore, the parties jointly
23 requested that the case be continued to August 28, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. in order for both defense
24 counsel to review the discovery. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the
25 Speedy Trial Act from July 24, 2006 until August 28, 2006. Defendant Flores, through her
26 attorney, J.A. Hudson, agreed to the exclusion. Defendant Campos, through his attorney
27 Assistant Federal Public Defender Cynthia Lie, agreed to the exclusion. The parties agree and
28 stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective

preparation of counsel.

SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

DATED:

/s/
SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED:

/s/
CYNTHIA C. LIE
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Counsel for Mr. Campos

DATED:

/s/
J.A. HUDSON
Counsel for Ms. Flores

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from July 24, 2006 until August 28, 2006. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 8/23/06

/s/ Ronald M. Whyte
RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge